

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed October 29, 2003. Claims 1-71 remain pending in the Application. Claims 1-10, 12-31, 33-43, 45-53, and 55-62 were rejected. Claims 1, 21, 22, 42, 43, 53, and 62 are being amended. Claims 63-71 are being added. No new matter is being introduced.

The abstract is being amended to be fewer than 150 words in length in accordance with MPEP 608.01(b).

Claims 1, 16-17, 21-22, 37-38, 42, 53, and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Price, "Deformable Mirror Multiplexer Driver Electronics Final Report". Claim 1 is being amended to recite, "at least one actuator continuously receiving said electrical signal from an amplifier continuously coupled to the signal electrode of said at least one actuator". The amendments to claim 1 are supported by FIGS. 4 and 14, which illustrate an actuator that continuously receives an electrical signal from an amplifier that is continuously coupled to a signal electrode of an actuator, and supported by the specification as originally filed at least at page 27, lines 3-5 ("[v]ia the signal electrodes 161, the actuators in the DM actuator array 70 are electronically coupled to the output of the high voltage amplifier 58.").

By contrast, Price discloses a deformable mirror including a multiplexer MOSFET switcher circuit as described in section 4.5 and shown in Figure 7. Price uses MOSFET switches "allowing for high voltage switching with excellent isolation during the off state. This is the critical factor in operating switches of this sort with a deformable mirror." In Figure 8, Price further shows a switch electrically located between the output of a high voltage power amplifier and a signal electrode of an actuator (i.e., PMN and PZT actuators). Thus, Price uses high voltage switches to connect and disconnect a high voltage power amplifier from a signal electrode of an actuator. The high voltage switching is in contrast to and teaches away from Applicant's claim 1 as amended ("... actuator continuously receiving said electrical signal from an amplifier continuously coupled to the signal electrode of said at least one actuator.") Therefore, Price does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for every claim limitation of

Applicant's claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21, 22, 42, 53, and 62 are being amended to include similar claim limitations (e.g., "continuously receiving") as claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-20, 23-41, 44-52, and 54-61 should be allowed over the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Price.

Claims 3, 18-20, 24, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price. Applicant is amending independent claim 1 to recite, "at least one actuator continuously receiving said electrical signal from an amplifier continuously coupled to the signal electrode of said at least one actuator", and independent claim 22 to recite, "said signal electrode of said at least one actuator continuously receiving an electrical signal". Price does not teach or suggest a signal electrode of an actuator "continuously" receiving an electrical signal. Therefore, because dependent claims 3, 18-20, 24, and 39-41 include these same limitations, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-13, 15, 23, 25-31, 33-34, 36, 43, 45-51, and 55-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of Gullapalli (U.S. Patent 6,424,076). Neither Price nor Gullapalli teach or suggest, alone or in combination, Applicant's independent claims as amended. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 2, 4-10, 12-13, 15, 23, 25-31, 33-34, 36, 43, 45-51, and 55-61 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 35, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price and Gullapalli as applied to claims 2, 4-10, 12-13, 15, 23, 25-31, 33-34, 36, 43, 45-51, and 55-61, and further in view of Angelbeck et al. (U.S. Patent 4,091,274). Price, Gullapalli, and Angelbeck fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, Applicant's independent claims as amended. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 14, 35, and 52 should be withdrawn.

Applicant : Solomon  
Serial No. : 09/616,106  
Filed : July 14, 2000  
Page : 26 of 26

Applicants' Docket No.: SOL00-03

With regard to objected to claims 44 and 54, new independent claims 63 and 68 include the limitations of dependent claims 44 and 54 and all of the limitations of base claims 43 and 53, respectively. Accordingly, claims 63-71 should now be in condition for allowance and such a Notice is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in order for issuance. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/1/04

Mark B. Solomon  
Mark B. Solomon

SolVisions Technologies Int'l  
82 Albemarle Road  
Norwood, MA 02062  
Telephone: (617) 388-7825  
Facsimile: (214) 526-0488